

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23613

the Federal yards, so-called, and the privately owned yards.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Mississippi was not only the author but also its great defender on the floor of the Senate. I wish him to know that I have told that story all over the State of Oregon.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Oregon for that, but is only right, proper, and sound that we should have this provision, because it has proved valuable in the years we have had it in the bill, and it has not hurt the Navy. There was a clause in the version we had, the so-called escape clause, which would permit latitude by the Secretary of Defense in cases where he had to make exceptions in the military interest of the Nation. But this is a highly controversial question, as the Senator well knows. There are sentiments both ways. It was impossible, with all the existing facts, at this time, to hold the amendment in conference.

I have not yielded one bit on my ideas concerning the matter. That was my plea on the floor and in conference, that we absolutely must have some surveillance over this very large amount of money—I believe it is \$850-odd million in the bill alone.

In justifying the money for the privately owned shipyards for the current fiscal year, there is pledged 26.3 percent of the funds to go to those yards, as the Senator knows.

I am going to write to the Bureau of Yards and Docks, to the Chief of Naval Operations, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and even to the President of the United States, expressing my opinion and my conclusions as to the need for this surveillance.

I am sure that other Senators will follow this problem with much interest. The Navy is on trial in reference to this matter. They do not like the restrictions. They have not lobbied with me, as the term is used, but they know that that is their provision. But, if this large amount of money did not get some surveillance, by Congress, Congress would be neglecting its duty. I also believe that the pressure will be so great, if we do not have this surveillance, that abuses could result.

We must absolutely, militarywise, maintain both kinds of shipyards. Each has its place. If the alteration, repair, and conversion capacity of the privately owned shipyards is going to remain unused, they cannot keep it standing there. They cannot maintain it on a standby ready-to-work basis from year to year as Federal shipyards can with the money of the Treasury Department behind them. They would have to liquidate the capacity. That is what would happen. Thus, I certainly pledge to the Senator my full interest in this matter.

Tomorrow I shall read the Senator's remarks in the Record. I shall also refer to them tomorrow when we take up the conference report, and summarize his points, if I may; and further address myself to those points so that they will all be in the Record.

Mr. MORSE. I am greatly indebted to the Senator from Mississippi. I thank

him very much. He has given me a fine statement. I could not ask for more. The Senator can do no more under the parliamentary situation.

The Senator from Mississippi states that he is going to support surveillance of expenditures of this huge budgetary sum of money which goes to the Bureau of Ships. That is all I can ask for.

When he tells me that he is going to write letters on this subject, including the President of the United States, he has gone all the way in trying to cooperate with me.

He made the comment that the Navy does not like restrictions. The Military Establishment never likes restrictions.

As the Senator from Mississippi knows, I feel that if we are to protect the private segment of the economy, if we are going to maintain civilian control over the military, the military must be subject to restrictions. It must not be placed beyond the reach of reasonable restrictions.

I have felt that surveillance is a reasonable restriction. I agree that the Navy shipyards must be kept strong. I have always defended strong Navy shipyards, and will continue to do so; but, I do not intend to surrender to the Navy in what I believe would be a weakening of the privately owned shipyards, if the surveillance promised by the Senator from Mississippi is not maintained.

Once again, I thank the Senator from Mississippi very much for the legislative history which he has made this afternoon.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. Let me add that there is general directive law on this subject with reference to the funds, but clearly there is still in order a limitation in the appropriation bill of the very type the Senate version of the bill contains, and so we are within bounds.

I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, early this year I was privileged to be the principal cosponsor of a bill introduced by Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, to reform our immigration laws. This was the Senate companion to the House bill now before us. The President and his four predecessors in that office have all called for a revision and modernization of our immigration laws. Clearly the time has come to abolish the national origins system. Indeed, this action is long overdue.

The national origins quotas are the antithesis of that for which we say the United States stands—a land of equal opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, creed, or country of national origin, a haven for the oppressed peoples of the world. We are given to quoting the words on the Statue of Liberty on patriotic occasions, but for 40 years we have tolerated grossly inequitable immigration laws that belie those words.

The people of the world are not blind to this sort of hypocrisy. We sometimes wonder why we do not enjoy everyone's unbridled friendship. We ask why our embassies are picketed by those we believe we have helped. To be sure, our immigration policies alone do not offer an explanation of this, but, as Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said:

The national origins principle, rather than the facts of our actual immigration, is picked up by people unfriendly to the United States and made an issue in their countries. This causes political disturbances in the good relations which we would hope to establish.

But reforming our immigration laws just to enhance our foreign policy is only one reason for changing our policy.

Immigration reform was urgently needed here at home. Our present laws actually deprive us of the contributions of brilliant, accomplished, and skilled residents of foreign countries who want to bring their talents here—and who would not displace American citizens because of the great need we have here for their unique skills.

In this regard let me say that the bill before us offers even more protection to American workers, while at the same time encouraging skilled and talented people to move to the United States. Primary responsibility is placed on the person who intends to immigrate to obtain the certification of the Secretary of Labor that his skills are needed in this country and are in scarce supply. People with needed skills are given a preferential status.

If these symbolic, foreign policy, and domestic reasons for revision are not enough, there is a fourth ground—simple humanity. This is the most compelling of all the reasons to reform our laws and, above all, abolish the insidious national origins quotas. The cruel operation of our 40-year-old immigration law has torn families apart, in some cases forcing them to choose between America and their children.

The national origins quota provisions have meant that people with little or no skill can come into this country readily, if they have the right country of origin.

A naturalized American from one of the southern or eastern European countries may have to wait 5 or more years to get his mother into this country. If he is from Asia—and somehow managed to overcome the policy of almost complete exclusion of these people—he may have to give up hope altogether of getting his mother into this country. And yet, either of these individuals could obtain a resident visa for his English maid in 5 weeks or less.

A brilliant Korean or Indian scientist is turned away, while the northern European is accepted almost without question. The bill before us would abolish the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions, which are nothing other than racial discrimination against Asians. While Plato and Dante would have a hard time getting into the United States if they were alive today, Confucius or Lao-tze could not get in at all.

The national origins quotas and the Asian-Pacific triangle provisions are irrational, arrogantly intolerant, and im-

moral. The time has come to ask those who come to our doors what they can do for this country—to paraphrase President Kennedy—not what country they come from or what their racial ancestry is.

I share the concern of Senators KENNEDY of Massachusetts, HART, and JAVITS that the limitation proposed in this bill on immigration from Western Hemisphere countries is backsliding from the high principles of the bill itself. And I share their hope that when the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration studies this issue it will find that this limitation is unnecessary.

I urge the Senate to give this bill its prompt approval. We have run out of adjectives to describe the import of the work we have done this session, but this bill reforming our immigration laws is truly something of which we can be proud. When we pass this bill we can hold our heads a little higher before the world.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senate is considering legislation to revise the immigration laws of our country. It has taken the labors of many people from many lands to make our country the great power and the great free nation it is today. I am happy to have cosponsored that legislation and to give it my fullest support.

This year marks the diamond jubilee of the Order of the Sons of Italy in this country. One of the proudest sons of Italy is Mario T. Noto, the Associate Commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. On August 25, 1965, in Baltimore, Md., Mr. Noto was the guest speaker at the supreme convention of the order. He delivered a moving speech, one which I commend to each of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have his speech included in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Italian community of Baltimore has produced many great Americans. Among them are such outstanding citizens as Thomas J. D'Alesandro, Jr., the former mayor of Baltimore, now a member of the Federal Renegotiation Board, and his son, Thomas J. D'Alesandro, III, the president of the city council of Baltimore.

Other ethnic groups in Maryland have provided community leaders of distinction and prominence, including some of our outstanding businessmen, civic leaders, and public officials. None would be in this country today if their grandparents or their parents, or, indeed, in some cases, if they themselves, had been refused entry into America.

In its present form, our immigration law is outdated, discriminatory, and in drastic need of revision. Such revision as is contemplated by the legislation which will soon come before us for a vote will allow my State and our country to continue to flourish through contributions made by persons from every corner of the globe. We must look beyond race, nationality, or ancestry to a person's ability to make a positive contribution to our society.

EXHIBIT 1

OPENING REMARKS BY MARIO T. NOTO, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, U.S. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, AT THE DIAMOND JUBILEE SUPREME CONVENTION OF ORDER SONS OF ITALY, AUGUST 25, 1965, BALTIMORE, MD.

I extend greetings to all the delegates and participants of this Diamond Jubilee Convention of the Order Sons of Italy. The accomplishments of this proud organization attest to your untiring and dedicated efforts and labors. Each of you, every member and all of us of Italian ancestry throughout the United States may well be proud of your achievements. You exemplify the true spirit of the Italian immigrants who grouped together in common ideals and beliefs to promote unity in a foreign land where they came to plant their roots.

At a gathering such as this, few are given the privilege to speak, and to be included among the few is an honor which I have accepted with genuine appreciation. I feel like the new doctor who was called by the coroner. He told the young doctor that he had made a mistake in filling out the death certificate. He told him he knew the form was complicated but as a doctor he must not sign his name in the space "cause for death." The new doctor looked at the coroner and with candor replied, "I may be a new doctor, but I must be honest." May I then take this occasion as an opportunity to offer you some of my reflections which you may find pertinent to the theme of your convention.

It is said, that to know nothing of the past is to little understand the present and to have no conception of the future. Let us then for a brief interlude revert to the past.

Sixty years ago, a group of serious minded and dedicated men met in New York to form an organization. They signed their names to a simple and yet impassioned document. This document chartered a fraternal organization—named the Order Sons of Italy. These men dedicated their purpose in simple but most meaningful language. Its unbreakable pledge ordained the allegiance of these men in the words "We, the members of the Order Sons of Italy in America, being a part of the United States of America, which we serve at all times with undivided devotion, and to whose progress we dedicate ourselves."

With these words, their aspirations and activities became assimilated into the broad and challenging patterns of the American way of life. These men were fully aware of the responsibilities they undertook. They knew they could do one of two things. They could bring honor and glory to their ancestry; or they could mutilate the dream of the future immigrant who wished to follow. But only time would tell. And it did—in the rolls of honor in government, in industry, in culture and in every cornerstone of American endeavor. Every avenue of human effort is lined with some contribution to our country's greatness.

Who were the dedicated men who grouped together to found this order? They were representative of the type of Italian immigrant to this country—of men and women possessed with God-given strength and determination. They were plain people—from small towns and valleys and mountains. They left their native land because they wanted to share in the spirit of hope, liberty and justice which this land offered. They migrated to uncharted lives in a foreign land equipped only with the endowments of birth and a faith in the future.

These early immigrants encountered bigotry and prejudices. Some of the kindest and most pungent words were "guinea" or "wop" or "dago." But without murmur they accepted the abuses and manmade hardships; and yet they seized every opportunity

to give of their work and culture. They gave heart, muscle, knowledge and loyalty.

Their gradual fusion with the multinational immigrants who came to this land before and after them has helped to produce an amalgamated society which has no parallel in the world.

The value of what they have given to America and its way of life has been recognized by no less than five Presidents of the United States. Each has advocated the elimination of that portion of our immigration laws which has closed the doors to those who would be immigrants amongst us except for their place of birth. And yet, despite the obstacles of the national origins system of our immigration laws, and within our one short generation, the Italian immigrant and his offspring has repaid America generously. His payments may be found not only in all that makes our country, but in other lands of the world—where his sons sleep in foreign soil, where they fell in defense of American ideals. He needs no praise or eulogy from me or any other man—for he has written his own history here with the calluses of his hands and the blood from his heart.

Our immigration law has had the effect of opening our doors to persons judged by race and place of birth rather than on an individual's worth to society. It ironically has discriminated with severity against southern and central Europeans. The formula of the national origins system is without basis and logic. Our own President Johnson has said, "There is no consistency in an American policy that both recognizes equality and capriciously bars immigration from countries of southern Europe."

And again it was our own President who in his first state of the Union message declared his solution in offering the criteria "Ask not, 'In what country were you born?' but 'What can you do for our country?'" He has consistently demanded a change to end the national quota. He has asked that each applicant be considered chiefly on the basis of occupational skill and family ties. This can only serve to enhance our Nation in the world community.

The story of the accomplishments of the Italian immigrant whether on this planet, or in this hemisphere or in America can be told in many, many ways. But the past is too well known. Its immeasurable value is well documented in the pages of history.

But now, what is the present and what is the future? The present and the future must reach greater heights. For the story of the American with Italian ancestry must be told in the forms of the beliefs, the ideals and the values which he has. It must be told to promote the truth, and to instill a deeper unity and stronger effort to further enrich our beloved country. It must be told to remove the ugly stains of prejudice made by those in our midst, who are still intolerant and condemn a whole people because of a few.

Unfortunately, there are a few of our ancestry who have not contributed to our greatness—instead they have detracted. But, in each flock some sheep must go astray—and as with some peoples of all nationalities, so it has been with some of Italian ancestry. The truth must be accepted. But it must also serve to enlighten and educate the bigots—who must be taught to accept the principle that each man must be judged and be accepted or rejected on his own record—and not on his ancestry.

Frequently, one reads or hears of the account of criminal activities of specific individuals. But too often the searchlight of sensationalism seems to shine on Italian names. We are told of the Italian or Sicilian mobster. Some of these were born here, some were brought here in childhood and some matured abroad. But the end product

September 20, 1965

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100290003-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23615

is not a creation of nationality or ancestry. And with the passage of time and addition of each succeeding name an unfair image has been presented. Where the facts are true—they cannot and should not be denied. Truth cannot and must not be suppressed—it must be surfaced.

But for the sins of the few wrongdoers, the image is not a true mirror of the 22 million people here who share the Italian ancestry. The image unjustly clouds in the minds of the public the true value of these God-fearing, loyal and dedicated Italian-Americans.

In a recent national publication depicting the fight of a large city against crime, of seven photographs shown of criminals, six had Italian names. An additional five photographs on another page had Italian names. No one disputes that the guilty must be punished. The law must be enforced with all the vigor it commands. The criminal cancer in our society must be curbed—regardless of nationality. But it is sinful to suppose that one creed, color or ethnic group has a monopoly on crime. Yet, there are some who would lead us to believe this.

God endowed each mortal with a will and destiny and each is accountable for his own to society. But a religion, a race or an ancestry must not be held accountable or adjudged guilty for the wrongs of the few. Let no common heritage be tarnished for those few.

And what is the answer to a false image? Can we remove it? Not only can we, but we must. The achievements of the past are prologue. But the positive achievements of today and the continuing contributions of the future to our society must be brought into sharp focus for all people to take note. But this cannot be nor should it be the responsibility of one voice or one organization. It must be the many. At each opportunity let the voices speak individually and in unison to point to the record of the good deeds. Let the people be informed of the true worth of those of Italian ancestry, but, let no one hesitate to denounce criminality regardless of nationality or ancestry.

The Order Sons of Italy was not organized as a pressure group nor must it be. It is what it should be, an assembly of faithful people who share a common ancestry. The community of its interests and objectives which unites its members is not different from that of the DAR, B'nai B'rith, the NAACP, and similar organizations. It seeks no special privileges. It is dedicated to the task of reflecting the collective qualities of a people of one heritage and to achieve equalities for all peoples regardless of race, color or creed. But above all, within our society it displays the whole heart, whole mind and the whole spirit of a people. Your organization is dedicated to the freedoms founded in 1776 and their preservation.

Let one fact be abundantly clear. Let there be no doubt. Ancestry is no expedient or justification for the worth of an individual. But neither shall it be the basis for rejection or ridicule. Ancestry cannot and must not be a substitute for ability or honor. Let no one clamor for recognition or reward on the basis of national origin. Recognition and reward must be commensurate with ability, not ancestry. In America the true test must lie in the virtue and value of man alone and not in the cry for ethnic recognition. As sons and daughters of immigrants we possess priceless heritage; and we hold to certain truths individually and collectively. We believe that where we find dissension, we must bring together; where we find need, we must provide; where we find wrong, we must remedy, and that when we are right we must prove it.

To the bigots, to the unscrupulous, and to the prejudiced, we shall continue to respond

with understanding and compassion. We shall continue to give generously of ourselves in toil and battle just as we have in the past and are doing in the present. To those who would question our unity, we say we are united for duty to our President and country; to those who question our sincerity, we say let our deeds be judged and to those who question our loyalty, let history be the proof.

I seek neither approbation or acclaim for what I speak. A man must account only to his God, his country, and himself for his beliefs. If what I have said is responsible then I alone am accountable for my words.

UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION SHOULD BE BASED ON QUALITY AND QUALIFICATIONS, RATHER THAN RACE OR CREED

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, from the very beginning of my service in the U.S. Senate I have sought to improve the immigration laws of our country. I supported with enthusiasm the recommendations made by General Eisenhower during his administration. They were designed to eliminate much of the harshness of the law, to give hope of reunion to divided families, and to offer a haven to some of the oppressed peoples of the world. They provided, of course, all the safeguards with respect to quality and character of those who looked forward hopefully to becoming American citizens.

Similar recommendations were made by the late President Kennedy, and I coauthored his proposals. Until this year, the House of Representatives failed to act, generally, in this field.

Last week I said in the Senate that I intended to vote for the pending legislation, which is grounded in the traditional American principles of fair play. The bill, as it emerges from the Senate Judiciary Committee, is a good bill, a fair bill, and a superior bill, from the standpoint of our country, to the bill which has recently passed the House.

Mr. President, I have the honor to represent in part the State of California, the most populous State in the Union. We are a heterogeneous State. Among our 19 million Americans living in California, none are more highly respected among my fellow citizens than Americans of Japanese extraction. The valor with which many of them distinguished themselves for bravery, wearing proudly the American military uniform in the Second World War, is well known to our people and to the world. They have written in feats of bravery, and in blood, a gallant chapter in the defense of American freedom. In peace, they have become leaders in all walks of life, in agriculture, in business, and in the public service in my State.

I have received a thoughtful letter from Mr. Mike Masaoka, the Washington representative of the Japanese-American Citizens League, which outlines the views of that organization favoring of the pending bill. I think Senators will find it helpful as this debate continues.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1965.

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: On behalf of the millions of Californians who believe in a more equitable and humane immigration code for our country, including the more than 50 chapters of the Japanese American Citizens League in your State, we are writing you at this time as the Senior Senator from California to urge your active leadership and vote for the principle and objectives of the immigration bill, H.R. 2580, as amended, which is now being considered by the Senate after being approved by the House of Representatives on August 25 by the overwhelming margin of 318 to 95 and reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee on September 8 by an almost unanimous 14 to 2 majority.

Both the principle and the objectives of the immigration bill are consistent with the statesman-like views which you have so courageously articulated and implemented over the past quarter of a century as a dedicated public servant.

The principle of the immigration bill is simple: To eliminate race as a qualification for immigration to the United States.

The objectives of the immigration bill are equally clear and compelling: To provide greater immigration opportunities, within numerical limitations, to members and close relatives of American citizen and resident alien families, to those whose professions, skills, or work will benefit the economy, welfare, or culture of the Nation, and to refugees from political or religious persecution or catastrophic nature calamity, all without regard to race, ancestry, national origin, religion, or color.

The immigration bill accomplishes these worthy purposes by substituting a new immigration system based on specified preference priorities for the existing national origins quota system and the special Asia-Pacific triangle "ancestry" discrimination.

It is not an attempt to comprehensively revise and amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, being limited in the main to removing race as a prerequisite for immigration.

Under the proposed legislation, the authorized total immigration remains approximately the same as under current law, and none of the security, health, "public charge", and other "safeguards" in the present statute are altered materially, except that those relating to certain prospective workers are "strengthened" considerably.

Because we are certain that many others have written you concerning the general arguments for this immigration bill, and because we are most qualified to comment on this legislation from the viewpoint of those of Japanese ancestry in particular and of Asian origins in general, we shall try to confine our letter to these latter aspects.

After all, except for Hawaii, California has always had the largest population of Asian Americans of any State. And, California, specifically, and the Western States, generally, have in the past been most responsible for influencing national legislation and Federal activity relating to those of so-called oriental ancestry in this land.

RACISM PRINCIPLE REJECTED

In addition to believing that the immigration bill clearly is in the national and international interests of the United States, JACL endorses this legislation because it—finally and completely—abolishes racism as an accepted principle and practice in American immigration law.

The racial concept was introduced into our immigration system 83 years ago in

1882, only 7 years after the initial congressional effort to regulate immigration, when the first of the Chinese Exclusion Act was enacted.

It was then extended by the so-called gentlemen's agreement of 1907, under which Japan undertook to restrict immigration to this country.

It was expanded by the barred zone, established in the Immigration Act of 1917, to include practically all of Asia and all of the Pacific Islands. Immigration by natives of this barred zone was excluded.

Racism in our immigration code reached its zenith in the Immigration Act of 1924, when the racial discrimination previously applied exclusively to only Asian-Pacific immigration was modified and made applicable to all of the nations of the Old World, including Europe, through the device of a national origins quota system formula for allocating immigration opportunities to the United States. This same statute, incidentally, also formally wrote Japanese exclusion into law by decreeing that aliens ineligible to citizenship were also ineligible for immigration.

Except for the special exceptions made for the Chinese (1943) and for East Indians and for Filipinos (1946), the first major breakthrough against racism in our immigration program resulted from the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality (Walter-McCarran) Act of 1952. That historic legislation eliminated race as a qualification for citizenship through naturalization for the first time in American history. It also repealed the racist barred zone concept by extending the token quotas of the national origins system to all the countries of Asia and the Pacific, but restricting this extension by continuing the "ancestry" discrimination of the limited Chinese, East, Indian, and Filipino Acts for the Asia-Pacific triangle area.

The Asia-Pacific triangle bias, which had its genesis in the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, requires that Asians, and only Asians, anywhere in the world are chargeable to the country of their ancestry, rather than to the place of birth, as for all other prospective immigrants.

Thus, Asians are subject to double discrimination. They are allocated minimal quotas under the national origins quota system. Then, under the "ancestry" attribution of the triangle, others of that ancestry elsewhere in the world are charged to the small and oversubscribed quota of their ancestral homeland, no matter how many generations removed.

Because the proposal abolishes the Asia-Pacific triangle restrictions immediately, and the national origins quota system limitations by June 30, 1968, JACL enthusiastically favors the immigration bill.

Indeed, passage of this legislation with its final repudiation of racism as a principal of American immigration and naturalization policy has been the major legislative objective of JACL since it was organized nationally in 1930, for almost without exception the legal, economic, and social discriminations directed against those of Japanese, and Asian, ancestry in this country have found sanction in such Federal practices.

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE OF DISCRIMINATION

Statistical evidence of the racial discriminations in our immigration law explains JACL's real concern for the immigration bill.

Of the authorized 158,361 quota numbers for all the nations of earth under the national origins system formula, for example, more than 50 percent of the world total are reserved for only two countries—England and Ireland. More than 70 percent are reserved for only three countries—England, Ireland, and Germany. More than 81 percent are reserved for the countries of Western and Northern Europe, and for all of Europe—98 percent.

Asia is authorized only 1.53 percent of the world total, and Africa even less—0.47 percent.

The Asia-Pacific triangle, to which only about one and a half percent of the total immigration quotas for the entire world are allocated under the 1924 national origins system, includes a vast, roughly triangular area that encompasses practically all of the Asian Continent except Soviet Asia and almost all of the Pacific Islands north of Australia and New Zealand. More than one-half of the earth's population resides in this triangle, which is comprised of 20 independent countries, ranging from Afghanistan to Western Samoa, and 16 subquotas, from Australia's Christmas Island to Portugal's Timor, in 23 quota areas.

Of these 23 quota areas, only China (205 for China and Chinese persons), Japan (185), Indonesia (200), and Malaysia (400) are authorized annual immigration quotas in excess of the minimum 100 quota numbers. In the cases of Indonesia and Malaysia, however, their totals are the results of previously minimum quota areas being joined, and are not national origins computations.

The Asia-Pacific triangle compounds the hardships imposed by the minimal allocations of the national origins system by attributing for immigration purposes all Asian persons, no matter where born, to the country of their ancestry.

No wonder Japan's waiting list for quota immigration is backlogged beyond 1990. That for the Philippines is oversubscribed for about 90 years. And the special quota for "Chinese persons" is for all practical purposes exhausted in perpetuity.

In the 145-year period, from 1820 to 1964, the Immigration and Naturalization Service reports the entry of 42,994,486 immigrants from all the world. Of this number, only 1,181,643 were from all of Asia, which includes more countries than are in the Asia-Pacific triangle. Those of Chinese and Japanese ancestry accounted for 759,000 of the Asian total, with 417,233 attributable to China and 341,767 to Japan.

Of all immigrants to the United States, those of Chinese ancestry account for 0.96 percent and those of Japanese ancestry 0.79 percent.

According to the 1960 census, there are in the United States 464,332 persons of Japanese ancestry, 237,292 of Chinese ancestry, and 176,310 of Filipino ancestry.

All persons attributable by ancestry to the Asia-Pacific triangle, including the Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos, total only 1,100,000 persons in this country, or about one-half of 1 percent of all the people in the United States.

FLOOD OF ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION IMPOSSIBLE

Some suggestions have been advanced that enactment of this immigration bill, repealing both the national origins quota system and the Asia-Pacific triangle and placing immigration from the Far East on the same basis as from Europe, for instance, might well invite a "flood" of immigration from the Orient.

Such fears, if they may be described as such, are, we believe, groundless.

After all, the restrictions and the exclusions of eight decades against those from Asia cannot be corrected in a single legislative effort. And the very arithmetic of past immigration now precludes any substantial gain in actual immigration opportunities for the Japanese, Chinese, and other Asians.

The immigration bill provides that, of the seven preference priorities, the first, second, fourth, and fifth preferences, accounting for 74 percent of the authorized annual numerical ceiling from Old World countries shall be made available to members and close relatives of American citizen and resident alien families. Only 26 percent is available for professionals, for skilled and unskilled labor in short supply, and for "conditional entries" or refugees.

Inasmuch as the total Asian population of the United States is only about one-half of 1 percent of the total American population, this means that there are very few of Asia-Pacific origin in this country who are entitled to provide the specified preference priorities to family members and close relatives residing abroad, even if all qualified family members and close relatives desire to emigrate immediately to the United States.

Thus, it would seem that, although the immigration bill eliminates race as a matter of principle, in actual operation immigration will still be controlled by the now discredited national origins system and the general pattern of immigration which exists today will continue for many years yet to come.

Moreover, repealing the discrimination of the Asia-Pacific triangle may well be meaningless, or at best less meaningful, if a numerical limitation is placed on immigration from Western Hemisphere countries.

Since those of Asian ancestry born in the New World cannot under existing American immigration law qualify as nonquota immigrants, but have had to seek such immigration opportunities within the small quotas of their ancestral lands, they are not now registered with their birth country from emigration to the United States. Accordingly, if the numerical limitation to be imposed is near or less than the actual New World immigration at this time, the chances that those of Asian ancestry would be issued passports and visas are at least rather slim.

JACL thus recommends that provisions be made to alleviate family hardship cases if a Western Hemisphere ceiling on annual immigration is imposed.

As a matter of fact, JACL doubts very much that many of Asian ancestry residing in Canada and Latin America would seek entry into the United States, regardless of any New World limitation. As a group, they are well accepted in their respective countries, integrated into the respective cultural patterns of their native lands, and successful in their respective businesses, professions, and industries. There is little reason for them to seek admission to the United States, where they would have to start life anew and, in many instances, learn a new language, new customs, etc. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has estimated that only about 5,000 would be involved if the Asia-Pacific triangle were abolished and no New World restrictions established.

Finally, even if the unlikely eventuality that in the near future nonpreference immigration opportunities may become available, after the seven preference priorities are satisfied, JACL notes that there are two provisions in the immigration bill that help assure, perhaps inadvertently, relatively minor immigration from the Asian countries.

One is that such "new seed" nonpreference immigrants are to be considered for immigration opportunities "strictly in the chronological order in which they qualify." If a condition of qualification is to have registered with an American consul, as we understand it, nonpreference Europeans will have a 28-year headstart on Asians, as they are eligible to register for immigration since the Immigration Act of 1924, while Asians were not eligible to do so until after the effective date of the Walter-McCarran Act, or December 24, 1952.

The other is that nonrelative immigrants, including professionals and skilled and unskilled labor, as well as nonpreference aliens, must secure, prior to the issuance of a visa, certification from the Secretary of Labor clearing such immigrants of prescribed conditions for entry. Such certifications may be rather difficult for Asians, especially from the less developed areas, to secure.

To sum up, though the immigration bill eliminates the principle of racism in our immigration law, which JACL applauds, in actual operation we fear that the pattern of immigration will remain approximately as

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23617

it is—and has been—because of past restrictions and exclusions of those of Asian ancestry which caused the family reunification features of this legislation to be less meaningful than they ought to be.

OUTDATED ALLEGATIONS

As a native Californian, Senator KUCHEL, you may well remember the Yellow Peril menace fears that were deliberately foisted and exploited in the pre-World War II West to explain and excuse the racial exclusion of the Japanese, and of the Chinese and other orientals too, from both immigration and naturalization.

While these slurs and slanders have now been thoroughly discredited, nevertheless there may be a useful purpose in reviewing some of the more emphasized ones in the light of the current legislation that propose to repeal the final racist discriminations against Asiatics in American immigration law. From time to time, one still hears these outdated allegations repeated.

The most vicious of all canards was that the Japanese especially could not be trusted as loyal Americans in times of national emergency, particularly if their ancestral homeland was involved.

The unprecedented combat record of the Japanese-American GI, who served with outstanding gallantry in both the European and Pacific theaters of World War II, refutes this charge.

While that war record is too well known to require documentation here, it may be well to remind Americans that the 442d Central Postal Directory, composed of Japanese Americans from the continental mainland and Hawaii, many of whom volunteered from so-called relocation camps to which they and their families had been evacuated from their west coast homes and associations, has been described as the most decorated American military unit in history for its size and length of service. And that General MacArthur's Chief of Staff for Intelligence has summed up the contributions of the Japanese-American intelligence troops in the Pacific as having saved millions of American casualties and billions of American dollars.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in inviting Japanese Americans to volunteer for combat duty against the enemies of America early in 1942, declared that "Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart, and not of race or ancestry."

By that yardstick, Japanese Americans are as loyal and dedicated to the cause of the United States as any other group of Americans.

That the Japanese, among other Asians, could not be assimilated into the mainstream of America—because of their Oriental background and heritage—was another major allegation directed against those of Japanese ancestry in the pre-World War II era.

The facts offer clear rebuttal.

Now group of Americans is more law abiding. Japanese Americans spend more time for education, including the college level, than the average American. More are in the professions than the average. More own their own homes, and operate their own business enterprises. The average income, individual and family, as well as urban and rural, are higher than their non-Japanese counterparts. They are more community and civic minded, contributing more on the average to such charities as the Community Chest, Red Cross, etc. At the same time, they remain off of relief rolls and generally refuse other government aid of a relief nature. They bought more war bonds, and buy more Government savings bonds.

By almost any legitimate criterion of exemplary citizenship and Americanism, Japanese Americans are an assimilated, integrated, and accepted part of the communities in which they live and of the Nation to which they owe allegiance.

Today, in California and in every other State in the Union, Japanese Americans in their lives and in their living prove anew the miracle of America. Involved in almost every line of human endeavor and activity, in your State and in every State in the Union, they have made significant contributions, and will continue to make substantial contributions, to the betterment of the community, State, and Nation.

Personifying the kind of Americans that those of oriental background can be and are, and serving as living refutation of all the stereotypes and smears once directed against those of Asian origins, are your two distinguished colleagues from Hawaii, Senators FONG and INOUYE.

Even more noteworthy than perhaps the accomplishments is that they were achieved in spite of special laws and ordinances, and economic and social practices, which were deliberately exploited to make more difficult, and to prevent the assimilation of the Japanese-Americans.

Indeed, according to a special compilation of a Cornell Law School professor, even as late as 1946, there were some 500 Federal, State, and local laws that directly or indirectly restricted and circumscribed the lives and opportunities of those of Japanese ancestry in the United States, citizens as well as aliens. Included were the so-called alien land laws which not only prevented resident alien Japanese from purchasing and owning real property but also restricted the right of their citizen children in these respects; prohibitions against the issuance of licenses to carry on certain businesses, enterprises, and professions; bars to certain employment; housing and rental restrictions, etc.

That orientals can create a community and state that is thoroughly in keeping with American ideals and traditions, and yet not be of the same ethnic and cultural heritage as those who overwhelmingly dominated in the 1920 census is witnessed in Hawaii, where most of the people of our newest State are of nonwhite ancestry.

There is no evidence, then, that the national origins system and the Asia-Pacific triangle discriminations in American immigration law should be retained and continued because of the activities—past, present, and potential—of those of Japanese, Chinese, and other Asian ancestry.

SUMMARY REASONS FOR IMMIGRATION BILL

JACL believes that there are many real and positive justifications for the early enactment of the immigration bill.

Among these reasons are the following:

It would complete the objective of eliminating race as an accepted principle and practice in our immigration law.

It would remove the stigma and insult of inferiority from certain peoples and nations.

It would demonstrate that our concern for the peoples and nations and problems of Asia are equal to our concerns for Europe.

It would bring our practices closer to our preachments of equality and equity.

It would strengthen U.S. leadership in the free world.

It would bring our immigration law into conformity with our civil rights and other such statutes dealing with the internal opportunities of our citizens.

It would help unite families separated by the vicissitudes of the existing immigration law.

It would encourage the professionals, the scientists, the educators, and the specially gifted and skilled to seek entry, thereby aiding our economic growth and enriching our culture.

It would help alleviate labor shortages, without reducing living standards, working conditions, and wages.

It would continue the great American tradition of a haven for the oppressed and the tempest-tossed.

It would bring about a greater and more prosperous Nation.

We regret that this letter is so long and detailed. But we are hopeful that it may be helpful in securing enactment of the immigration bill, H.R. 2580, as amended. We are also hopeful that this will be the last time that we need to urge the Congress to reject racism in our immigration code for humanity, dignity, and the national interest.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

MIKE MASAOKA,
Washington Representative.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who have been working on rather extensive speeches on the pending measure. A number of those speeches will be speeches in opposition to the bill. Perhaps some of them—I presume some of them—will be speeches in behalf of the bill. Merely in the hope that a Senator may want to make a rather lengthy speech, or even a short speech, on the subject before we close our business for tonight, I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum. It is my hope that we can get on with this legislation. There are several important measures which must be considered—and this is one of them—before the Senate adjourns sine die.

I would hope we could sit until a later hour tomorrow. I take this means of notifying the Senate that we hope to get a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate on the measure tomorrow. If we cannot get it then, perhaps we can make the request the following day.

Mr. President, upon that basis, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to refer again to the discussion here in the Senate yesterday concerning the actions we have taken in the Dominican Republic. Overnight, I have reflected on my statements at that time. As much as I dislike being in disagreement with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I nevertheless continue to believe that the actions of the President were necessary in the national interest of the United States.

We simply cannot stand idly by and run the risk of another Communist takeover in the Western Hemisphere, and we must act promptly when there are clear indications that this may well be taking place. I realize that many will charge me with being "trigger-happy," but I believe that any other course would lead to much worse consequences than the Senator from Arkansas suggested yesterday might result from our intervention in the Dominican Republic.

In my view, it is essential that social revolution, if indeed sufficient progress

cannot be achieved by social evolution, in the Western Hemisphere must not become a tool by which Communist domination is achieved. We all certainly know that there are no "independent" Communist regimes. Any Communist-directed group which gains control of a nation will do the bidding of either Moscow, Peking, or the Castro government at Havana, and such foreign domination is condemned by the unanimous action of all the nations in the Western Hemisphere.

It is a matter of judgment in each individual situation as to the action it is necessary to take and the time to take it. In this particular case, the Senator from Arkansas has reached the conclusion that we should have risked the takeover. Even though I can agree that we might have done more at an earlier stage to use our influence to resist the ascendance of the Communist elements in the rebel forces, I would like again to state that I do not believe President Johnson could have done anything other than use the direct power of the United States as events actually developed.

We had an experience in Louisiana when there was an attempt to overthrow and take over the government. Where that occurs, and there is an attempt to forcibly take over a government, if the legal authorities move soon enough and with overwhelming force, there need be no fight; but if there is a move with only a small amount of force, the government might have a battle on its hands. While we in our State may be criticized by some as being in a "banana republic," we in Louisiana have done business with Central and South America, and we know what the term "banana republic" means. We have traded with Central and South America, and we know that at times certain interests in our State have taken sides in these revolutions as they have occurred.

So I believe we have an understanding of the problems of Central and South America.

In that connection, Mr. President, I do wish to complain about the completely irresponsible handling of the matter by a newspaper for which I have great respect, the Washington Post. That newspaper for the most part tends to report the news by standards that are generally regarded as good ethics. In this particular case the reporting has been bad and the editorializing and writing of the news has been so bad that it has made me wonder whether the reporter, in reporting the debate and writing about the events—which was done by the same reporter, Mr. Goshko—received his training in the schools of the United States or the Soviet Union. Some of those stories have been with regard to this Senator.

It is beyond me to understand the point when someone says we went in with too much force. The safe thing to do is to send a great number of troops, and more than would be needed for a fight, so that Communist elements that might decide to fire on American troops would know they could not defeat the forces of the United States and therefore would not try it. That is the point I made.

All the press reported, as reflected by the articles written by John Goshko of the Washington Post, who chose the Communist philosophy of reporting, was that I talked about my father. He reported that I said "Daddy." I do not believe I said that.

That is all the reporting we got in answer to the statements that we sent in too many troops.

The point is that the best thing is to send in enough troops so that the enemy knows it could not succeed.

The typical Communist-type reporting said only that I made reference to my father. I did so only by way of illustration. When there was a confrontation with what appeared to be a ragtag army to overthrow law and order in that state, they were faced with overwhelming force.

I made reference to people who were organizing and intended to resist the lawful authority of state government.

When the National Guard appeared, the only person who had been hurt was a person who shot himself in attempting to get through a barbed-wire fence. He had shot himself with his own gun. No one else was injured.

When this Nation sent in substantial forces in the Dominican Republic, the Communists or Communist sympathizers, as well as rebel elements, out of caution, in very few instances fired on our troops.

Unfortunately, there were some courageous Americans lost in our effort to preserve freedom and democracy in the Dominican Republic.

Then there were those of the rebel forces who were fired on by our marines and Army troops acting in their own defense and the defense of those that they went there to protect.

I made another point. If it is thought that there is going to be a Communist takeover, the sooner we move and the faster we move, the sooner and easier it will be over.

Our intelligence information was that the Communists were progressively gaining power and control over the rebellion and they were satisfied how difficult it was going to be to keep the Communists from taking charge of the rebellion movement and to keep the Communists from moving in during a situation of chaos; that it was the kind of situation in which Communists take over.

About the only reference I got by this Soviet-type reporter of the Washington Post was that I referred to the Confederacy. Oh, yes; I made an arm-waving speech. I use my hands when I am speaking extemporaneously.

The Post reporter said I referred to the Confederacy. What I said was that a great number of battles are lost, because people move too slowly; or, to use the expression that comes from World War II, "too little and too late." Great Britain suffered much in the early days of the war because her forces came either too late or were not numerous enough to prevail in the battles that occurred.

With regard to the initiative, which is something that is taught in any military exercise, I merely pointed out that there had been occasions when victory

was within the grasp of one side or the other if it had exercised the initiative soon enough. I gave an illustration. In a small way, the junior Senator from Louisiana is a student of the Civil War. If, on the first day of the Battle of Shiloh, Albert Sidney Johnston had not been bleeding to death in the saddle because he declined to relinquish command, and if Gen. P. G. T. Beauregard, a resident of my State, had not found himself in command and for lack of better information called off the attack on the first day, but had waited until the atmosphere had been cleared of smoke, and had renewed the attack on the following day, and if General Beauregard had instead pursued the attack, he would have driven General Grant's army into the river. At least, that is what most military experts think. That would then have been a great southern victory of the magnitude of the Battle of Bull Run; and the North having suffered nothing but major defeats, with one victory by Grant at Fort Donelson, the South would have been encouraged, and the capture of Vicksburg and the many other successes that Grant enjoyed thereafter would probably never have occurred. Grant would probably have been relieved of his command and have been dishonored as a result of having been totally unprepared for the attacks that fell upon him in more hostilities than one. I cited that merely as an example by which people exercise the initiative and prevail, when otherwise they would not.

The Soviet-type reporter for the Washington Post said I spoke about the Confederacy. I gave that as an example to prove that, by moving timely, rather than moving late, one could prevail in what he was seeking to do.

I regret that the Washington Post seems to feel so prejudiced about the matter that it cannot report both sides of the debate. The Post is a responsible newspaper. In the main, I have observed that it has conducted itself according to the highest standards of journalism. I regret very much to see this exception.

There is no doubt in my mind that the President had the information he needed to know that this Nation was in danger. Seeing the nature of the republics that have been taken behind the Iron Curtain, the President, in my judgment, saved this country from allowing one more nation to undergo communism by moving so timely as he did. The fact that he moved so soon and with such complete justification, both to protect American lives and to help restore order and enable the people of the Dominican Republic to elect whatever government those people want in free elections, was, in my judgment, a great contribution to freedom and democracy in this hemisphere.

The people of the Dominican Republic would never have had the right to elect a government of their choosing had the Communist brutality succeeded. The record shows that in every country in which the Communists have prevailed, up to this time, the government has been one which has denied the

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23619

people their right to a free election and a free choice of government. This was accomplished by force of arms, through the movement of troops, or else by sabotage and subversion, in which people were murdered. The result was that the people were denied the right to choose their own government.

No one can predict with any certainty what the people of the Dominican Republic will do when they vote on their choice of a government within 9 months; but at least they will have a chance to choose. If the Communists take over the Dominican Republic, they will have to do it by winning an election, not by murder, assassination, and armed revolt; not by denying the people the rights that a free people should enjoy in Cuba and everywhere else in the Western Hemisphere.

RECESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 20, 1965:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1972. (Reappointment.)

U.S. MARSHAL

Emmett E. Shelby, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Florida for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Donald F. Miller, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant:

Frank C. Morgret III	Joseph B. Donaldson
William H. Low, Jr.	Jerald L. Rendall
Earle W. Keith III	Stanley E. Wood, Jr.
Bruce W. Thompson	John L. Bailey
Gregory J. Sanok	Ronald C. Addison
Joseph Marotta	Patrick H. Cannon, Jr.
James C. Carpenter	Frank R. Peasley
Derrill R. Kramer	James K. Woodle
Ruloff W. Whitman	Edward R. Pusey, Jr.
Kenneth L. Lambertson	Pat Murray
John W. Keith	James R. Shontell
Frederick H. O. Mayr	Richard E. Van Ry
Ralph E. Knorr	Franklin E. Taylor
Jack A. Eckert	Donald C. Addison
Francis W. J. Nicely	James F. Hunt
Hai M. Floyd	Gerald W. Barney
Leeland N. Gregg, Jr.	Frederick S. Bowman
William C. Donnell	Roy L. Foote
Vincent R. Abrahamson	Allen E. Rolland
Donald H. Ramsden	James L. Walker
George R. Grochowski	William L. Avery
Homer A. Purdy	David W. Proudfoot
Richard F. Young	Damian A. McIntosh
John E. Malloy III	James L. Mueller
Roger D. Williams	Richard J. Kiesel
Roger T. Ostrom	Joseph H. Discenza
Donald F. Kemner	David H. Withers
David I. Tomlinson	Leonard J. Pichini
George H. Martin	William S. Haight
	Frederick D. Smith
	Charles W. Morgan

Robert A. Bastek
Alexander C. McKean, Jr.

Larry D. Brooks
Francis W. Mooney
Ronald M. Potter
Richard C. Blaschke
Stephen H. Hines
George A. Casimir
Robert K. Blaschke
Thomas P. Keane
Thomas H. Lloyd, Jr.
Thomas W. Boerger
John G. Denninger, Jr.

Arthur R. Gandt
John W. Brittain
Lawrence M. Schilling
David W. Robinette
David H. Whitten
Harvey L. Wahnquist, Jr.

John P. Ryan
Harry A. Allen
Joseph L. Valenti
Lance A. Eagan
Richard B. O'Keefe
Hugh L. Thomas, Jr.

William J. Wallace, Jr.
Eugene Hornstein
John A. Wuestneck
Michael J. Schiro
Harold L. Bonnet
Arthur W. Mergner, Jr.

Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
Frederick A. Kelley
James H. Lightner
Raymond D. Bland
James F. Greene, Jr.

Arthur E. Henn
John T. Mason
Joseph H. Sanford
Joseph J. Smith
Lawrence J. Dallaire, Jr.

Peter C. Hennings
Walter M. Coburn
Henry B. Traver
William H. Spence
Wade M. Moncrief, Jr.
David S. Gemmell
Richard V. Consigli

Carl H. Burkhardt
Joseph P. Dibella
Neal Mahan
George E. Archer, Jr.

Glenn E. Haines
Timothy G. McKinna
Peter T. Muth

Richard E. Shrum
David T. Boyle
William A. Borchers
Edward K. Roe, Jr.
Michael O. Murtagh
Joseph L. Crowe, Jr.

Anthony J. Sottys
William H. Roth
William C. Heming
James A. Umberger
Kwang Ping Hsu
Albert F. Baker

William S. Murray
George E. Mason
Norman H. Huff
Clifford E. Banner
Don M. Kcehn
Thomas D. Smith

Daniel M. White
Thomas F. McGrath
III

Thomas S. Whipple
Robert D. Markoff
Raymond J. Houtteker

David K. Carey
Louis M. Casale
John M. McCann
Peter M. Bernstein
Robert E. McDonough, Jr.

Joseph R. Finelli
Wayne P. Stevens
Jack W. Whiting, Jr.
Philip J. Bull
Harry N. Hutchins III

Thomas W. Watkins
III
David W. Hastings
David M. Hurst
Richard D. Greenough, Jr.

Thomas J. Keeney
John G. Schmidtman
Robert F. Boysen, Jr.
James C. McElroy
James F. Sanders
Hugh W. Nabors

Francis J. Stadnicki
Bly R. Elder
Gary L. Rowe
Branson E. Epler
Stephen L. Richmond

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles W. Abbott
James W. Abraham
James R. Aichele
Harry L. Alderman
Richard D. Alexander
Arthur W. Anthony, Jr.

Peter F. C. Armstrong
Maurice C. Ashley, Jr.
Freddie J. Baker
James M. Bannan
William D. Bassett, Jr.
Arnold E. Bench

Lee R. Bendell
Garland T. Beyerle
Darrel E. Bjorklund
Louis A. Bonin
Eugene R. Brady
Robert B. Brennan

Edward J. Bronars
Robert G. Brown
Travis D. Brown
Clement C. Buckley, Jr.
Thomas J. Burckell
Donald J. Burger

Conrad P. Buschmann
Kenneth M. Buss
John E. Buynak
Raymond A. Cameron
Richard E. Campbell
David I. Carter
Clement C. Chamberlain, Jr.
Byron T. Chen
Gregory J. Cizek

Harold C. Colvin
Jack W. Conard
Andrew B. Cook
Charles G. Cooper
William R. Corson
Franklin G. Cowie, Jr.

Harry O. Cowing, Jr.
William E. Cross, Jr.
Philip M. Crosswalt
George D. Cumming
Bruce F. Cunliffe
Ralph L. Cunningham, Jr.

John K. Davis
Thomas J. Deen, Jr.
Claude E. Deering, Jr.
Francis L. Delaney
Lewis H. Devine
Birchard B. De Witt

LeRoy M. Duffy
Jimmie W. Duncan
Cecil C. Dunnagan

Carl J. Emma
Clyde L. Ever
Gilbert W. Ferguson
William B. Fleming
Kenneth S. Foley
Eugene D. Foxworth, Jr.

Richard H. Francis
Walter A. Gagne, Jr.
Joseph J. N. Gambardella
Jesse L. Gibney, Jr.

Robert N. Good
Carlton D. Goodiel, Jr.
Fred Grabowski
Fredric A. Green
John R. Greenstone

John E. Greenwood
William R. Grubaugh
Robert E. Gruenler
Edward M. Gueil
Thomas I. Gunning

Frederick M. Haden
John W. Haggerty, III
Lawrence A. Hall
Wayne L. Hall
Andrew E. Hare

Elwin B. Hart
Harold A. Hatch
George A. P. Haynes
George E. Hayward
Keith H. Helms
Hans W. Henzel

Stanley A. Herman
William M. Herrin, Jr.
Charles O. Hiett
Henry Hoppe III
William W. Horn
George W. Houck

Dwight E. Howard
Robert E. Howard, Jr.
David J. Hunter
Robert E. Hunter
David J. Hytrek
Edgar K. Jacks

Mallett C. Jackson, Jr.
Charles V. Jarman
John M. Johnson, Jr.
Warren R. Johnson
Charles M. C. Jones, Jr.

Richard E. Jones
Nick J. Kapetan
William C. Keith, Jr.
Don L. Keller
Paul X. Kelley
Calhoun J. Killeen

Grover C. Koontz
George R. Lamb
Joseph M. Laney, Jr.
James W. Laseter
Randlett T. Lawrence
Frederick D. Leder

Harris J. Levert, Jr.
Alan M. Lindell
Carl R. Lundquist
Dean C. Macho
James H. MacLean
Byron L. Magness

Robert B. March
Donald E. Marchette
James W. Marsh
James G. Martz, III
Jerry F. Mathis
Frank D. McCarthy

Bain McClintock
Daniel F. McConnell
William G. McCool
Norman B. McCrary
Robert L. McElroy
James R. McEnaney

Donald N. McKeon
Joseph V. McLernan
Paul G. McMahon
Alexander P. McMullan
Russell W. McNutt
Edward J. Megarr

David G. Mehargue

Willard D. Merrill
James F. Meyers, Jr.
John B. Michaud

Richard D. Mickelson
Donald C. Miller
John H. Miller
Robert R. Montgomery
Anthony A. Monti
Ira L. Morgan, Jr.

Roddey B. Moss
Ross L. Mulford
Joseph Nastasi
Robert C. Needham
Harry J. Nolan
Victor Ohanesian

Robert W. Oliver
James R. Omara
Charles H. Opfar, Jr.
Thomas A. Palmer
William K. Parcell
Tom D. Parsons

Roger W. Peard, Jr.
Edward F. Penico
Arthur R. Petersen
George R. Phillips
Reagan L. Preiss
Vincent J. Pross, Jr.

Heman J. Redfield, III
Pierre D. Reissner, Jr.
Clarke A. Rhykerd
David M. Ridderhof
Edward J. Rigby
Thomas E. Ringwood

Dwight E. Roberts
Kenneth L. Robinson, Jr.
William K. Rockey
Charles A. Rosenfield
Earl F. Roth, Jr.
Edward J. Rutty

Victor A. Ruvo
Raymond M. Ryan
Joseph L. Sadowski
George T. Sargent, Jr.
William F. Saunders, Jr.
Cornelius F. Savage, Jr.

John P. Schied
Baxter W. Seaton
Ronald I. Severson
Charles A. Sewell
Ural W. Shadrick
Richard W. Sheppe

Warren C. Sherman
George H. Shutt, Jr.
Emmett B. Sigmon, Jr.
Warren J. Skvaril
Albert C. Smith, Jr.
Edward E. Smith

Erin D. Smith
George W. Smith
Richard J. Smith
Thomas G. Snipes
William F. Sparks
Eugene O. Speckart

Newell D. Staley, Jr.
Donald C. Stanton
Marvin H. Stevens
Harold E. Stine
Donald R. Stiver
John H. Strobe

Otto I. Svenson, Jr.
Oral R. Swlgart, Jr.
Leonard C. Taft
Aubrey W. Talbert, Jr.
Richard B. Talbott
Robert W. Taylor

Jay J. Thomas, Jr.
Francis H. Thurston
Donald K. Tooker
Marshall J. Treado
Rodolfo L. Trevino
Luther G. Troen

George F. Tubley
Kenneth E. Turner
David M. Twomey
Wendell N. Vest
Hal W. Vincent
Michael J. Vrabell

23620

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

Theodore R. Wall
Ralph D. Wallace
Edward R. Watson
Robert A. Walker
Charles A. Webster
William Wentworth

Thomas B. White, Jr.
William V. H. White
Robert D. Whitesell
Charles K. Whitfield
Charles S. Whiting
Daniel M. Wilson

James S. Wilson
Frederick M. Woeller
Henry E. Wold
James W. Wood

Harry D. Woods
Richard B. Wyatt
Albert J. Zilogar
John L. Zorack

The following-named officers of the Marine
Corps for permanent appointment to the

grade of lieutenant colonel subject to quali-
fication therefor as provided by law:

William C. Adams	Wesley D. Lamoureux
Eugene D. Anderson	George M. Olszewski
William C. Bittick, Jr.	Harry D. Persons
Johnny L. Carter	James W. Wilson
Walter W. Fleetwood	